



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,082	01/07/2002	Carl Scarpa	HA-87 (HAL-ID 202)	2422
26479	7590	11/16/2005	EXAMINER	
STRAUB & POKOTYLO				BHATIA, NEERAJ R
620 TINTON AVENUE				
BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR				
TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724				
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				2661

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/041,082	SCARPA, CARL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neeraj Bhatia	2661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 9-11, 19, 20 and 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 12-18, 21, 22 and 24-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9-11, 19, 20 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 2 recites the limitation "The method of claim 2" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 12, 17, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Rupp.

With respect to claim 1, Wright in Patent No. 5,809,083, discloses a method of processing a frequency division multiplexed signal including a plurality of tones comprising a receiver 500 in Fig 5, receiving a frequency division multiplexed signal Fig 3, and calculating a channel estimation and updating it periodically (column 10 lines 24-32) using techniques that are known in the art (column 13 lines 35-37). Rupp in Patent No. 6,393,068 discloses a method performing a constant modulus based update operation to update a channel estimate (column 2 lines 31). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art

at the time of the invention to include a constant modulus based update operation in Wright in order to clean up channel estimation corresponding to independent OFDM carriers.

With regards to claims 12 and 24, Wright discloses a method as stated above that also uses a comparator 632 Fig 6 that outputs a number that corresponds to the periodic position of the differentially encoded pilot word, and is used by the pilot symbol extractor 518 Fig 5 to extract pilot symbols of pilot words from the symbol stream. The extracted pilot symbols are then compared with their expected values (threshold) and performs channel estimation and compensation techniques that are known in the art based on the comparison (column 13 lines 28-36).

Regarding claim 5, Wright discloses a method as stated above also including a method of detecting the periodic position of differentially encoded pilot words within a symbol stream (column 9 lines 55-58) and extracts the pilot symbols of the differentially encoded words and provides them to the channel estimator 520 Fig 5 (column 10 lines 12-20). The channel estimator compares the amplitudes and phases of the extracted symbols with the expected amplitudes and phases, to thereby estimate the effects of the channel on the transmitted signal (column 10 lines 24-27).

With regards to claims 6 and 25, Wright in view of Rupp discloses a method as stated above that discloses all that is in claim 6 in 25, as stated in the rejections of claims 24 and 1.

With claim 7, Wright discloses a method as stated above that interpolates estimates obtained over multiple pilot periods to generate symbol-specific amplitude and phase adjustments to apply to channel-impaired data symbols (column 10 lines 33-36).

With claims 2 and 17, Wright discloses a method as stated above further comprising a channel compensator 522 Fig 5 that uses the output of the channel estimator to adjust or correct the amplitudes and phases of channel – impaired data symbols (column 10 lines 40-43).

5. Claims 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Koslov (Patent No 5,471,508).

Regarding claims 18 and 21, Wright discloses a method of updating a channel estimate for a carrier signal of an OFDM communication signal as stated above, but does not disclose a reduced constellation decision directed channel estimate update operation to update the channel estimate. However, Koslov discloses a carrier recover system that uses a reduced constellation slicing method. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include a reduced constellation slicing method in Wright in order to accurately track variations in frequency and phase that may occur to a carrier (column 13 lines 20-28).

Art Unit: 2661

6. Claims 3,4, 8, 13-16, 22 and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Rupp as applied to claims 1, 2, 5- 7, 12, 17, 24, and 25 above, and further in view of Koslov.

With respect to claim 26, Wright in view of Rupp discloses all that is stated above, but fails to disclose an amplitude and phase channel estimate update method for each individual tone, as a function of the signal noise measurement generated. However, Koslov discloses a method using reduced constellation slicing (column 13 lines 20-28). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include in Wright in view of Rupp the reduced constellation slicing in order to have a channel estimate that cleans up multipath distortion based on phase and amplitude, since constant modulus only cleans up distortion based on the envelope (amplitude) of the signal.

With regards to claim 30, Wright in view of Rupp discloses all that is stated above, but fails to disclose a full decision directed channel estimate update module. However, Koslov discloses a system using a full constellation slicing method. It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Wright in view of Rupp a full constellation slicing method in order to obtain a carrier recovery signal lock.

With respect to claim 22, Wright in view of Rupp in further view of Koslov discloses a method as stated above that discloses all that is in claim 22 as stated in the rejections of claims 21, 1, and 26.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 8, and 13-16, Wright in view of Rupp discloses all that is stated above, but fails to disclose a reduced or full constellation decision

directed update operation. However, Koslov discloses a carrier recovery system that uses both reduced constellation slicing and full constellation slicing. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include in Wright a reduced constellation decision directed update and a full constellation decision directed update among the channel update techniques to in order to accurately track variations in frequency and phase that may occur to a carrier (column 13 lines 20-28).

With respect to claim 27, Wright in view of Rupp in further view of Koslov discloses all that is stated above, which discloses all that is in claim 27, including generating an updated channel estimate that is coupled to a channel compensation module and a channel estimate update selection module as stated in the rejection for claims, 12, 2, and 26.

Regarding claim 28, Wright in view of Rupp in further view of Koslov discloses all that is stated above, which discloses all that is in claim 28, including a constant modulus based channel estimate update method as stated in the rejection for claims 27 and 26.

With claims 29 and 31, Wright in view of Rupp in further view of Koslov discloses all that is stated above, which discloses all that is in claims 29 and 31, including a reduced constellation decision directed update method as stated in the rejection for claims 28 and 26.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 9-11,19, 20, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Thomas (Pub. No: US2003/00114164) discloses a method and system for adaptive channel estimation techniques. Sudo (Patent No. 6,625,111) discloses an OFDM communication apparatus including channel estimation and phase compensation. Westman (Patent No. 6,680,967) discloses a receiver performing multiple channel estimations. Zhu (Pub. No: US2002/0039383 discloses a method and apparatus for reducing signal degradation using an interpolation of many channel estimates.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neeraj Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)272-5204. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NB



CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600